

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 2-19, 21, 22 and 24-25 are pending in the present application. Claim 12 is amended to include the feature of a monolithic ellipsoidal mirror that directs a beam through multiple filters. Claims 24 and 25 have been submitted to include the feature of locating the spinning mirror face near a first focal point of the monolithic ellipsoidal mirror. Claim 25 further includes the feature of locating a detector near a second focal point of the monolithic ellipsoidal mirror. Support in the specification for the features recited in newly submitted claims 24 and 25 can be found in paragraph 60 of the present application. It is stated that ellipsoidal mirrors have a property that all light rays diverging from a small spot near one focal point are reflected in such a way that the rays are again focused into a small spot near the other focal point.

In the outstanding Office Action claims 2, 6-8, 11-17, 18, 19 and 21 rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Stedman et al* (U.S. Patent No. 5,498,872). It is respectfully that *Stedman et al* does not teach or suggest all the features as recited in the claims of the present application. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

The invention as recited in claim 12 includes “a monolithic ellipsoidal mirror that receives a beam from the spinning mirror and directs the beam through the filters”. As illustrated in FIG. 5 of the present application, by having a monolithic ellipsoidal mirror this will allow the spinning mirror to direct the beams through multiple filters.

It is argued in the outstanding Office Action that *Stedman et al* discloses a spinning mirror phase that reflects the beam so that the beam reaches each of the filter elements in

sequence. *Stedman et al*, however, fails to disclose a **monolithic ellipsoidal mirror** that receives the beam from the spinning mirror and directs the beam through the **filters**”.

Stedman et al in FIG. 3, at best, discloses multiple mirrors that receive beams from a spinning mirror 27. Each of the multiple mirrors correspond to a single filter and directs the beams from the mirror to the corresponding filter. However, the invention as recited in claim 12 includes the feature of monolithic ellipsoidal mirror that directs the beam through **multiple filters**. Thus, *Stedman et al* fails to disclose the feature of “a **monolithic ellipsoidal mirror** that receives from the spinning mirror and directs the beam through the **filters**.”

In view of the foregoing withdrawal of the rejection of claim 12 is respectfully requested.

The remaining depending claims all ultimately depend upon claim 12 and therefore include all the features recited in claim 12. Therefore it is respectfully submitted that the remaining dependent claims are patentable over *Stedman et al* for at least the same reasons argued above with respect to the rejection of claim 12.

In view of the foregoing withdrawal of the rejection of claims 2, 6-8, 11-17, 18, 19 and 21 are respectfully requested.

Newly submitted claim 24 includes the feature of a spinning mirror face that is located near a first focal point of the monolithic ellipsoidal mirror. Newly submitted claim 25 includes the feature of a detector located near a second focal point of the monolithic ellipsoidal mirror. As illustrated in FIG. 5 of the present application and discussed in paragraph 60 in the present application, an ellipsoidal mirror has two focal points such that the mirrors have a property that all light rays diverging from a spot near one focal point are reflected in such a way that those rays are again focused into a small spot near the other point. The unique layout of the monolithic

ellipsoidal mirror will allow for a dual foci reflective device for light distribution for a full 360° rotation of the spinning reflector. *Stedman et al* is silent with respect to these features of the invention recited in dependent claims 24 and 25.

CONCLUSION

It is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner does not believe that the application is in condition for allowance, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner contact the undersigned attorney if it is believed that such contact will expedite the prosecution of the application.

In the event this paper is not time filed, Applicants petition for an appropriate extension of time. Please charge any fee deficiencies or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 50-2036.

Respectfully submitted,

BAKER & HOSTETLER LLP



Gregory B. Kang
Reg. No. 45,273

Date: October 29, 2003
Washington Square, Suite 1100
1050 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036-5304
Telephone: 202-861-1500
Facsimile: 202-861-1783